

PROPOSAL RATING AND RANKING SUMMARY

SCHEDULE EVALUATION

3 DECEMBER 2009

Schedule Proposals

All three Proposers provided excellent schedule documents, each with significant strengths consistent with the Project's goals and values. All proposed Project completion dates were well within the required "no later than" completion date of December 19, 2014.

The Proposer's schedule submittals included Proposal Schedules, which demonstrated the general plan of the Work, and a narrative, which was required to:

- describe how phasing strategies facilitate completion of useable segments, and how they provide early improvement in regional mobility and major regional arterial connectivity; and
- show the compatibility of the proposal schedule with contractual and proposal elements.

Values

The Department developed values that underlie the identified Goals and which were communicated to the Proposers in the RFP to guide their strategies in delivering the Project. The values addressed issues specific to the Project, its features, location, and impacts to the immediate communities. Specifically, the Department stated that all work must be completed no later than December 19, 2014 and identified that it valued:

- Innovative construction and MOT strategies that balance early Project completion with regional mobility; and
- Early completion of useable portions of the Project (Segments) if they provide benefit to the traveling public

Evaluation

Evaluation criteria were developed to advance the Department's values and were identified in the RFP. Four evaluation factors were developed, they are:

- **HIGH** Completing the Project quickly and efficiently
- **HIGH** Completion of Segments that improve regional mobility and provide major regional arterial connectivity
- **MEDIUM** Compatibility of the schedule with contractual and proposal elements,
- **LOW** Department project management cost savings as a result of a shorter Project completion schedule

An evaluation team comprised of individuals with differing expertise all related to various aspects of scheduling the work reviewed each of the schedule Proposals and ranked them according to the following:

Evaluation Criteria	Flatiron/Skanska/Zachary (FSZ)	Provo River Constructors (PRC)	Timpanogos Transportation Constructors (TTC)
High (combined):	Exceptional	Very Good	Very Good
Medium	Good	Acceptable	Very Good

Low	Very Good	Exceptional	Very Good
-----	-----------	-------------	-----------

Differentiators in Rankings

For the combined **High** factors, **FSZ** was ranked **Exceptional** and was significantly higher than the other two Proposers because their schedule best advanced all of the Project values identified in the ITP. While they do not reach Project Completion the earliest, they commit to provide substantial Segments and key sub-segments earliest. FSZ was also the most efficient team. By Segmenting and sequencing the Work, they spend the least amount of time for every Project mile delivered on the I-15 mainline.

In addition, they strategically sequence and commit to providing Segments and sub-segments so as to provide the most benefits to the public the earliest. Such improvements include:

- Completing 6.6 miles of mainline improvements and two interchanges at the highest traffic volume area in the project (Lehi Main Street to Geneva Road) by 10/05/11
- Early off-mainline improvements at the most congested portion of the Project (University Parkway), such as reconstruction of the westbound lanes, a westbound flyover, the connection of College Drive to northbound I-15 by 10/11; as well as a pedestrian tunnel by 10/10
- Providing additional lanes and other improvements on Geneva Road by 10/11, prior to working on the adjacent portion of the I-15 mainline, which provides an early benefit to the public and assists in regional mobility impacts due to later construction.
- Phasing within several of their Segments to better address regional mobility concerns, such as the early release of a portion of the southern-most Segment (Spanish Fork Main Street Interchange) at the same time as the Segment from University Avenue to UPRR, so that four travel lanes will be available between US 6 and University Avenue in both directions by 10/11.

PRC was rated as **Very Good** in the combined **High** factors and in the first position because they advanced some of the Project values and achieved Project Completion the earliest, on 01/29/13, which is substantially sooner than the other two Proposers (but was the least efficient, taking the longest time for every mile of mainline delivered). However, unlike the other two Proposers, they did so at the expense of the Department's other identified values, specifically, balancing early Project delivery with providing useable segments that improve regional mobility; and by only minimally providing useable portions of the Project early to benefit the public (they provide only one early Segment, comprising one interchange and approximately 4.6 miles of mainline from Pleasant Grove Blvd. to Lehi Main Street, which is in the most high-volume area, by June of 2012).

Notably, the ITP requires a narrative describing "how phasing strategies facilitate completion of useable segments, and how they provide early improvement in regional mobility and major regional arterial connectivity." PRC's narrative, however, was limited to two primary issues: the date of delivery of the Project and the early completion of the northernmost segment. Other than providing ABC methods, PRC did not describe any phasing or commit to the delivery of other improvements early that would benefit the public.

For instance, they stated they would provide a CFI at University Parkway, but did not commit to when it would be provided. In contrast, TTC provides a CFI at the same location and commits to delivering it by 09/10; and they delay the start of an adjacent work so that the CFI will mitigate regional mobility issues. This balance of delaying a portion of the Work until completion of another portion mitigates impacts to regional mobility captures the intent of the Department's value statement. PRC made no such commitment to early completion of the CFI, which may assist them in costs or allow for earlier Project delivery, but prevents the public from the beneficial use of the CFI until as late as Project Completion, a full 2.5 years later than the use of TTC's CFI.

An additional concern, which was not captured in the rankings but was universally felt, was that PRC has approximately 82% of the Project finishing on December 30, 2012, well into the winter season. With such an aggressive schedule much of the work is likely to be near-critical and any delay could force the completion to be extended further into winter, likely resulting in the Work being delayed until the next-year's construction season.

TTC is rated as **Very Good** in the high category because, like **FSZ**, **TTC** Segments and sequences their Work strategically to provide certain facilities early that alleviate existing regional mobility issues as well as mitigate future impacts they introduce while delivering the Project. They advanced all of the Project values identified in the ITP, including balancing early Project completion with regional mobility. For instance, they provided approximately 50% of the Project early (09/30/12) while targeting those areas that would benefit most from the improvements. They also committed to a very early release (09/10) of a CFI at University Parkway and to not starting adjacent mainline Work until the CFI was completed.

They did not receive an Exceptional and are ranked second the Very Good category because, in aggregate, they provided the Project later than the other two Proposers (the last 50% finishing in 09/13 versus 82% finishing in 12/12 for PRC and 17% finishing in 11/13 for **FSZ**). Also, one of the last Segments delivered is one of the longest in duration and contains the most congested portion of the Project.

Medium Factor: Compatibility of the schedule with contractual and proposal elements,

In the **Medium** category, the teams were rated based on their schedule documents compatibility with contractual and proposal elements. **TTC** was rated **Very Good** based on a clear, reasonable, well organized schedule that was consistent with their schedule narrative and Proposal as a whole. **FSZ** was rated **Good** because their schedule had some conflicts with contractual requirements, but they addressed those issues and/or made commitments in their narrative that overcame those deficiencies. **PRC** was rated **Acceptable** as they had some conflicts with contractual requirements but did not address all of them in their narrative and because their schedule and narrative were not aligned with their proposal documents. For instance, their schedule had two segments, the second of which had three sub-segments, which were not addressed in their narrative. Their organization chart showed they would be structured into three groups, which did not align with the either 2 or 4 segments/ sub-segments, and they identified only two Segment managers, which did not align with their organization.

Low Factor: Department project management cost savings as a result of a shorter Project

In the **Low** Category, the evaluation team assumed that labor and associated costs are in proportion to the work performed, which equalizes them among the Proposers, however, the Department's overhead costs are in direct relation to time. As such, the Proposers were ranked according to how quickly they delivered the Project. **PRC** was rated "Excellent" as they completed the Project in 01/29/13, **TTC** was rated as "Very Good" based on their Project Completion of 10/30/13. **FSZ** was also ranked "Very Good" but in second position based on a Project Completion of 12/05/13. The differences in ranking were considered minor as the differentiator was limited to the Department's Project office costs for one year.

Summary

FSZ submitted an Exceptional schedule by being the most efficient and in delivering usable portions of the Project quickly, and committing to their schedule with additional segments and start dates above and beyond the contract and proposal requirements. **PRC** submitted a Very Good schedule, delivering the full project the quickest, having the lowest project management costs for the Department by doing so, but working along the entire project corridor the longest. In addition, **PRC** did not commit to providing more than one useable portion early and focused on meeting the contract and proposal requirements but did not commit to additional delivery

dates. TTC submitted a Very Good schedule, second to PRC due to the later delivery of multiple portions of the project.